DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 307 SP 011 158

AUTHOR Wallace, James M.
TITLE From Procession to Profession: An Historical Case Study in the Governance of Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); Educational Legislation; *Governance; Organizational Effectiveness; *Political Influences; Political Issues; Power Structure; Professional Associations; *State Boards of Education; State Departments of Education; State Standards; *Teacher Associations; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Educator Education
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

In 1973, the Oregon legislature transferred from the State Board of Education to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission full legal authority over teacher certification and decertification and over the accreditation of teacher education programs. With this move, governance of the educational profession was removed from the control of laymen (elected officials, appointed officials) and placed in the hands of practicing educators themselves. Decision making on educational matters was transferred to representatives of the groups affected, i.e., teachers. The movement in the state, over a period of years, culminated in placing Oregon educators in a legal position comparable to that of members of professions such as medicine and law in giving teachers authority to control preparation for, and entry into, their own occupation. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141307

From Procession to Profession: An Historical Case Study in the Governance of Teacher Education

James M. Wallace

I

Among the excellent questions which Lawrence Cremin has put to historians is the following: "What agencies, formal and informal, have shaped American thought, character, and sensibility over the years, and what have been the significant relationships between these agencies and the society which has sustained them?" He goes on to note that "to ask the question thus is to project our concerns beyond the schools to a host of other institutions that educate: families, churches, libraries, museums, publishers, benevolent societies, youth groups, agricultural fairs, radio networks, military organizations, and research institutes."(1)

We may extend Cremin's list to include not only "other institutions that educate," but those other agencies which directly affect our formal educational processes. Within the American constitutional structure, education is primarily a function of the states. And thus the various agencies - chiefly state departments of education - which are legally responsible for education have received considerable historical study and analysis.(2)

SP011 158

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

One of the significant functions of state departments of education has been the certification of teachers and the evaluation and approval of the programs which prepare them. Although it is exceedingly difficult to trace cause-and-effect relationships in such areas, certification and accreditation have been developed and supported on the assumption that these processes would contribute to the improvement of the teaching force and thus to better learning on the part of public school students.

Within this context, then, some scholars have traced and analyzed the development of certification and accreditation and have attempted to determine their role in the larger educational picture.(3) Studies of these processes and of the agencies which carry them out have been limited, however, by a common problem: most historians did not recognize their significance early enough, and thus missed opportunities to study ephemeral documents and to interview the participants. State agencies have been notoriously careless about preserving materials, and scholars have been handicapped by the lack of necessary documents and of the haphazard ways in which many of them have been preserved.(4)

The establishment of a new kind of educational agency in Oregon in 1973 presented an opportunity to record and interpret from its beginnings the work of a potentially

significant educational enterprise. In 1973, the Oregon legislature transferred from the State Board of Education to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission full legal authority over teacher certification and decertification and over the accreditation of teacher education programs.

This shift was significant for several reasons:

(1) It placed Oregon educators in a legal position comparable to that of members of professions such as medicine and law in giving teachers authority to control preparation for, and entry into, their own occupation.

(2) The National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers are working to establish practitioner control over teacher preparation and licensing. The Oregon Commission is acknowledged nationally to be the model which most nearly exemplifies the governance objectives of these organizations.

(3) The transfer of authority demonstrated the power of teacher organizations in state politics. In spite of the opposition of some influential legislators, educational groups, and individual educators, the teacher organizations were able to achieve their legislative objectives concerning certification and accreditation.

This essay attempts to place this recent development in historical perspective. It may be read as a case study

of how educators in one state have gradually but effectively asserted control of an important aspect of their occupational lives. And in tracing this development, it may illuminate in a small way some issues of current concern to educational historians.

II

We may begin by establishing the historical context within which these recent events occurred. The process, like that in most areas of American life, and specifically within education, has been one of centralization and bureaucratization. Developments in Oregon followed some of the same steps as were taken in other states. The first territorial legislature, meeting in 1849, passed a law requiring the district court of each county to appoint "three competent men to act as school examiners." The duties of these three-man boards were:

> To examine all persons who wish to become teachers in their counties and no person shall be entitled to receive pay for any services rendered as a teacher out of the common school fund, who shall not have first obtained a certificate of qualifications to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, English grammar, and geography, and also moral character from said board of examiners or one of them; and furthermore, said board of examiners shall certify what other branches the person receiving the certificate is qualified to teach.(5)

In passing this law, Oregon skipped a stage which many of the older states had gone through: certification by town

or district authorities. Oregon - perhaps drawing on the experience of other states, and perhaps because of its rather dispersed population - determined that counties were the appropriate units to handle certification.(5)

Harry Matthew, from whose research this information is drawn, notes that the examination system for certifying teachers was used in most states during this period. Particularly in the West, where there were no institutions of higher education, this was the only reasonable approach to certification.

This was clearly an era of localism in education. The certificates held by teachers were valid only in the counties in which they were granted.(6) And lay control of teacher licensing, which was to survive in Oregon until 1973, was direct and personal. The respectable and influential men of the community were to pass on the academic and moral fitness of prospective teachers. The first three examiners in Washington County, for example, were a clerk of the United States Court, a missionary, and a minister who was also a newspaper editor.(7)

At the next session of the Territorial Legislature, in 1851, the certification process was brought closer to the people, as the law was changed to provide for direct election of the examiners. But this reform was short-lived, and in 1854 authority to examine teachers was granted to

county superintendents.

At the risk of over-interpreting these rapid changes, one can at least see in them models of varying approaches to certification: first, control by rather elitist appointed boards; second, authority by more democratic elected boards; and third, decision-making by educational administrators. (It should be noted, however, that many county superintendents were only part-time educators.) It must be remembered that under all three of these arrangements also, the concept of lay control was unquestioned.

When Oregon became a state in 1859, most of the territorial laws regarding education were adopted unchanged. The only major innovation was the creation of the office of state superintendent of public instruction, with the governor to hold the office. A separate superintendency was not established until 1873. (8)

The actual implementation of the 1854 certification law was a far cry from the impersonal and bureaucratic system which was to evolve later. A good example of the informality of these early arrangements can be seen in this announcement from the Oregonian for February 3, 1865:

> All teachers wishing to obtain certificates or to have their certificates renewed, in order to take schools in the county during the coming spring and summer, or longer, are requested to call at my home, corner of Third and Jefferson Streets, for examination . . . G.H. Atkinson, County Superintendent. (9)

A first step toward due process for applicants was taken in 1862, when the Legislature authorized the State Superintendent to hear appeals from teachers who felt they had been unfairly treated at the county level.(10) If the Superintendent felt that an appeal was justified, he could grant a certificate under the same provisions as one granted oy a county superintendent. This was but a small step toward centralization, however, as the certificates were valid only within the applicant's county. The only element of state centralization here came in the fact that a state-wide perspective was available to aggrieved teachers. Had this system survived and been actively implemented, it might gradually have developed greater consistency among county examination practices.

III

In 1872, the Legislature passed a major education law establishing a separate office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and a State Board of Education. The governor maintained an active role in educational matters, however, as he became one of the three members of the new State Board, the other two being the Secretary of State and the new State Superintendent. Some interesting cross-currents were moving here. There was an effort at partial decentralization of the governor's authority, as some of his functions were transferred to a new state superintendent.

But there was simultaneously some incipient centralization of certification authority, as the new state board was granted the power to act as a board of examiners and to grant teaching certificates. Thus, there was now a dual system, as both county superintendents and the state board had licensing authority.

A further element of standardization and centralization lay in the fact that examination questions were now prepared quarterly by the State Board and issued to the county superintendents by the State Superintendent.(11)

In passing, it is interesting to note one contemporary interpretation of these events. Robert Raymer, writing in 1929, said of the 1872 law:

> This was good legislation, based not on theory but on the actual experience of seventeen years of operation of public schools in Oregon and the knowledge of the methods of operating schools in the older states ... No bureaucracy was given a monopoly of education. In these present days, when socialistic theories of state compulsion and regulation of the lives of citizens have eaten deeply into the freer and more democratic institutions of the earlier days, it is refreshing to look back to times when citizens kept within their own control the ordering of their lives instead of confiding that direction to governmental officials. (12)

In 1882, a first step was taken toward what later was called the "approved program" approach to teacher education. In that year state normal schools were established at

Monmouth and Ashland, and provisions made to issue teaching certificates to their graduates on the basis of examinations administered by the normal schools. This same arrangement was extended to approved colleges and universities in 1891. Graduates who completed particular courses of study were granted state certificates. However, abuses of the system soon appeared, and in 1899 the legislature took this privilege away from the institutions and required that graduates be examined by a county or state examining board.(13)

In 1911, the legislature passed the Hawley Act, which restored to approved teacher education programs the authority to recommend graduates for certificates without external examination. This act also transferred certificate-issuing authority from the State Board of Education to the State Department of Education, a shift which may be seen as a further step toward the bureaucratization of certification processes. Judgments which had previously been made by laymen were now to be made by professional educators working for a growing state agency.(14)

Matthew, writing in 1932, said that the Hawley Act "became the framework around which the structure of the system of certification of teachers in Oregon has been built since that time." (15) Within this structure, many changes were made: different types of certificates were issued;

requirements were gradually increased; teacher education programs were established, modified, and sometimes phased out. But the pattern of certification by the State Department of Education, with recommendations by teacher education institutions, was to remain intact until 1973.

In 1937, the old pattern of certification by examination was dropped, further extending the influence of teacher training programs. Applicants were now required to go through approved teacher education institutions in order to be recommended for certificates.(16) In that same year, the legislature passed a law requiring high school teachers with five-year certificates to have a year of education beyond the bachelor's degree. The law provided a phase-in period, however, so that its provisions did not fully apply until 1943.(17) The general framework of current requirements was completed in 1951 when the legislature passed a law (effective in 1955) requiring elementary teachers to complete four-year programs in approved institutions.(18)

IV

In her detailed study of teacher education in Oregon, Joy Gubser described a long tradition of professional involvement in teacher education matters. While it is clear

that legal lay control of these matters was not challenged, a pattern emerged in which state superintendents as early as 1910 formally sought the counsel of educators concerning certification and teacher education.(19)

Before 1946, the Certification Committee of the Oregon Education Association had been the chief source of such advice. At this time, of course, the Oregon Education Association - like its counterparts in other states - was broadly representative of practicing educators. Its membership included teachers, administrators, and persons from higher education. Thus such a committee could speak with some authority for a wide range of educators. This situation changed significantly in the 1960's and 1970's as most administrative groups withdrew from the National Education Association and its state affiliates.

In 1946, Superintendent Rex Putnam appointed a group called the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Certification, with thirty-seven members representing the Oregon Education Association, the classroom teachers organization, organized administrative groups, and all of the approved teacher education institutions. From this Committee can be traced various developments which led to the establishment of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission twenty years later.

The committee functioned as anticipated during the early years of its existence. After nine years of operation, however, it began to take some steps which broadened its impact considerably. In 1955, it called upon the State Board of Education to appoint a committee to make a comprehensive study of certification matters.(20) After discussing the recommendation with the State Board, Superintendent Putnam in 1956 appointed a ten-member Certification Study Committee. Not surprisingly, given Superintendent Putnam's strong administrative bias, half of the committee's membership was made up of superintendents and principals. Two represented classroom teachers, one was the Executive Secretary of the Oregon Education Association, and two represented teacher education institutions - one public and one private.(21)

The Committee, which held its first official meeting in September 1956, worked closely with the Certification Section of the State Department of Education in developing its recommendations. After two years of study and meetings, the Committee, in May 1958, presented its findings to the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Certification. The report called for a variety of changes, including a drastic reduction in the kinds of certificates issued, five years of preparation for both elementary and secondary

teachers, completion of approved programs rather than specific courses, and certification based on the recommendation of teacher education programs.

That September, the State Board authorized wide distribution of the report throughout the State. The State Department of Education, the Certification Study Committee, and the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Committee of the Oregon Education Association were all active in publicizing the report and in soliciting reactions to it. Out of all this discussion came - not surprisingly - the appointment by the State Superintendent of yet another committee. This group, which first met in October 1959, was called the Study Committee on Norms, and was expected to develop proposals for specific requirements in all certification areas. Whereas the Certification Study Committee had been administratively dominated, the new group clearly represented the perspectives of higher education. Three members came from college academic departments, two were from college education departments, and only one of the six represented classroom teachers. The Norms Committee established twenty subcommittees to draft proposals for requirements in various teaching fields. During 1960 and 1961 the norms developed by the subcommittees were studied by the Steering Committee and by educators from throughout the state.(22)

At the same time, the 1958 proposals of the Certification Advisory Committee were still under study and discussion. In response, the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Committee of the O.E.A. began to more forcefully represent the concerns of classroom teachers, and circulated the results of a study which indicated that teachers would resist increases in standards as long as salaries remained low.

Another small step toward the current governance situation in teacher education was taken in 1961, when the Oregon legislature appointed a seven-member Certification Review Committee. The fact that this group was established by the legislature rather than by the State Superintendent enhanced its authority and prestige, and it gradually replaced the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Certification, which held its last meeting in January, 1962. (23)

The 1961 legislature also passed legislation intended to clarify and rationalize the confusing certification situation in the state. The new laws (Oregon Revised Statutes 342.120-342.17) did not immediately have the desired effect. One apparent intent of the new law was to prevent the imposition of a fifth-year requirement for elementary teachers. The question then arose as to whether or not the State Board could discriminate between elementary and secondary teachers

by requiring the fifth year only of the latter group. One legislator pointed out possible social class implications of fifth-year requirements by stating that they would "discourage youngsters from low and middle-income families from entering elementary teaching."(24)

After two contradictory Attorney General's opinions, the Board in 1962 first passed, and then repealed, the fifth-year requirement for elementary teachers. According to Gubser, however, this was only one of three (out of a total of nineteen) 1958 recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Certification which were not put into effect. Clearly, this administratively-dominated committee had had its impact, and had given force and direction to emerging trends in Oregon teacher preparation and licensing.

A review of the above developments shows a pattern of gradual centralization of certification and teacher education activities in the State Department of Education. Decisions which had once been made at the local level by county examiners and superintendents, came to be made by state examining boards and the state superintendent. With the growth of the teaching population, an educational bureaucracy developed, and decisions were delegated to the staff of the certification office in the State Department of Education.

One can also see a gradual shift from full lay authority over teacher preparation and licensing to a situation in which educators themselves gradually assumed some advisory power. But who were the educators who were giving the advice? It is clear that throughout most of this period, administrators and college personnel occupied the chief positions of influence. The significant committees which developed major reports, proposals, and legislation were dominated by principals, superintendents, professors, and deans. During the next decade and a half, this pattern was to change dramatically - and probably permanently.

V

A brief look at national developments in teacher education governance may help to put the Oregon situation in perspective. In 1946 the National Education Association created a National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS).(25) This group represented an awakening recognition that educators themselves should have a greater voice in defining the conditions under which teachers were to be prepared and licensed. A major outcome of this group's efforts was a report issued in 1961, titled New Horizons for the Teaching Profession. One of the more influential recommendations of this landmark document was the following:

> It is recommended that every state legislature in the United States establish a professional standards board ... as an adjunct to the office of the chief state school officer, but charged with the responsibility for accreditation and co-ordination of teacher education programs and certification of professional personnel. (26)

The Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission of the Oregon Education Association, building upon some of its own previous work, and encouraged and guided by the recommendations of N.C.T.E.P.S., in 1962 appointed a Professional Practices Act Committee. In April 1963, this Committee held its first meeting under the chairmanship of Paul Kambly, assistant dean of education from the University of Oregon.(27)

By December 1964, the Committee - with assistance from Legislative Counsel - had drafted a proposed Teacher Standards and Practices Act and had received assurances of support from the O.E.A. Representative Council, and from key staff members in the State Department of Education.

After a rather convoluted history of legislative hearings, compromises among supporters of the bill, and political maneuvering, a Bill was finally passed calling for the establishment of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. The Act, signed in May 1965, by then-Governor (now U.S. Senator) Mark Hatfield, created a Commission of sixteen educators to advise the State Board on matters

relating to teacher education and certification.

The main controversy surrounding the bill had been whether or not non-educators should serve on the Commission. Not surprisingly, the Oregon School Boards Association strongly desired lay membership. The Oregon Education Association opposed such participation, and successfully lobbied for its point of view during passage of the bill. Two points are worthy of note here. First, prior to this bill, the normal pattern had been for various educational groups to achieve a working consensus on major educational legislation. The 1965 T.S.P.C. bill represented the beginnings of the dissolution of that consensus. Second, this situation provides one of the first examples of effective lobbying power on the part of the Oregon Education Association. From this small beginning, the O.E.A. was to become, by 1973, one of the best-financed and most influential lobbying groups in Oregon.

The Commission thus established held its first meeting in January 1966. Membership consisted of four elementary teachers, four secondary teachers, a city and a county superintendent, an elementary and a secondary principal, a representative of public teacher education and one of private teacher education, and two educators serving at large. During the first few years of its existence, the Commission spent much

of its time and energy deciding on recommendations concerning waivers of certification.

It did, however, conduct two studies: one on teacher retirement and one on teacher misassignment. But the Commission during its first three years was clearly under the domination of Dr. Gubser, who was at the time administratively responsible within the State Department of Education for teacher certification and preparation.

In 1969, when it employed its own executive secretary, the Commission began to exercise more autonomy. In doing so, it came into its first open conflict with one of its supporting groups. In that year, the Commission published the results of survey of Oregon teacher opinion, and some of the teacher responses were harshly critical of teacher education. For example, 64% of the teachers surveyed reported that the education courses they had taken were either not very valuable or were very poor. Some teacher educators, speaking through a group known as the Deans and Directors of Teacher Education, objected to the publication of such information, feeling that it was not "constructive criticism."(28)

The Deans and Directors came under further pressure when Dale Parnell, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, asked the Commission to draft a "Master Plan" on teacher education, teacher certification, and teacher recruitment.

The Commission created state-wide committees, with much involvement from public school educators, to develop the plan. While a number of people from teacher education programs were active in this effort, complaints were voiced that higher education was not being heard sufficiently and that some of the proposals developed were based on a negative view of existing teacher education.

This became one of the major themes of the Commission's work, both before and after the transfer of legal authority in 1973. Once the Commission was established in 1965, it received relatively little attention from legislators or the lay public. Legislators, if they thought about the Commission at all, apparently felt that it needed time to work out its own problems before further legal attention was required. But as the Commission became more effective, and as it became involved in more significant activities, it became a forceful spokesman for public school interests and viewpoints. And in so doing, it put higher education in an increasingly defensive position.

This defensiveness was clearly evident during the development of the "Master Plan" which was finally submitted to the Board of Education in 1971. It came out even more strongly during work on a set of "Process Standards for Educational Personnel Development" which were completed and given to the Board the following year. These Standards were

intended to promote and guide the development of teacher education programs which were to be competency-based and governed by consortia of colleges, school districts, professional organizations, and teacher education students. Some outspoken teacher educators felt that the competency orientation was premature and that the proposed consortia infringed on higher education's rightful territory.

It should not be inferred from this that there was a constant battle under way between the Commission and higher education. Within the Commission itself, there was consensus on most issues. The Commission, for example, developed a set of Standards for Competent and Ethical Performance which most Commissioners and educators in general found acceptable and useful. The Standards were submitted to and adopted by the Board of Education in 1970, and were subsequently adopted (sometimes with modifications) by a number of school districts. The Commission was also actively involved, with substantial consensus, in the review, modification, and adoption of new certification rules in 1971. On those rare occasions when there was significant conflict within the Commission, it was usually between teachers and administrators, rather than between higher education and public education. Two such incidents came about when the state superintendent asked the Commission for advice on statewide tenure and on sanctions in case of a possible teacher strike.

But it became increasingly clear that higher education was beginning to lose its long-held dominance of certification and teacher education matters. Thus when the 1973 legislature considered a bill to grant the Commission full authority for accreditation, certification and decertification, the Deans and Directors requested amendments which would provide that the State Board of Education retain approval authority over Commission policies, and that appeals of Commission decisions would go to the Board.(30)

Such amendments would, of course, have kept the Commission in its non-autonomous state. In spite of this opposition, and that of the Oregon School Boards Association, the Oregon Association of School Administrators, and some representatives of the State Department of Education, bills were passed at the 1973 legislature transferring full legal authority over these matters to the Commission.(31)

The new bills changed the structure of the Commission somewhat. The two positions held by educators serving at large were abolished, and three public positions established. Two of these were to be held by private citizens and the third by a member of a school board. Although teacher organizations were opposed to public membership on the Commission, they finally accepted it as a trade-off for the new autonomy of the group.

The transition from Board authority to Commission authority was smooth, and was facilitated by Board adoption of three significant documents only two days before the shift took place. On June 29, 1973, the Board adopted the Planning Statement on Educational Personnel Development, Standards for the Approval of College and University Teacher Education Programs, and Process Standards for Educational Personnel Development Programs. This was something of a magnanimous act on the part of the Board. Encouraged by Superintendent Parnell, the Board thus gave the Commission a set of documents and proposed policies (all of which had been drafted initially by the Commission) with which to begin its work. The Board was, in effect, giving the Commission its public blessing as it undertook the risky and innovative task of providing professional governance of teacher education and certification.(32)

The four years which have elapsed since then have demonstrated that professional control of such matters is effective. In spite of the expressed fears of higher education and others, the Commission has acted forcefully and responsibly to improve Oregon teacher preparation and licensing. During this time, the Commission has:

- developed and implemented policies and administrative rules to control its operation and its relationships with other agencies;

- conducted accreditation visits to all of Oregon's fourteen teacher education programs (including four joint visits with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education);
- revised certification rules and adopted new endorsements in such critical fields as reading;
- improved the process of issuing certificates, and reduced the time required;
- decertificated and otherwise disciplined educators who have proven their unfitness to work in public schools;
- granted waivers of certification to persons who have demonstrated their competence to teach;
- worked with the State Department of Education and other agencies in assisting teacher education programs to meet personnel needs caused by Oregon's new minimum standards for public schools and new competency-oriented graduation requirements;
- supported and implemented legislation requiring that educational personnel be properly certificated for the positions they hold.

In carrying out the above activities, the Commission has proceeded with legislative backing, with cooperation from most educational groups, and with increasing encouragement

from teacher organizations. Administrative groups have been generally supportive, although they have been nervous about the impact on school districts of more forceful application of the certification rules.

As was the case during the Commission's seven years in an advisory capacity, however, it is higher education's ox which has been gored. Teacher education programs have been required to develop programs to meet new certification rules, to prepare annual reports, and to submit to fairly frequent and thorough accreditation visits. To add insult to injury, these visits have not followed the common log-rolling pattern of many accreditation groups, in which higher education personnel take turns approving one another's programs. Commission accreditation teams consist of one-third teachers, one-third administrators, and one-third higher education representatives. The needs and perspectives of public school personnel are thus well represented on accreditation teams, and colleges and universities are forced to respond positively to those needs and perspectives.

After all this pressure, it is thus not surprising that higher education is still resistant to the Commission's efforts. A recent meeting of the Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education demonstrated that the deans and directors have not yet come to terms with the Commission.

With only four dissenting votes (all from small private colleges), the group voted not to support proposals which would have provided greater Commission involvement in in-service teacher education.(33)

Another way of tracing these shifting tides of power is to examine the Commission's leadership patterns. Two of the first three chairmen of the Commission were representatives of public higher education. (The other was a teacher who had been active in getting the Commission established, and who is now on the national N.E.A. staff.) It is clear that at this early stage, public school people still deferred somewhat to higher education and looked to it for leadership. Since 1968, however, no college or university representative has been Commission chairman.

During the period from 1969 to 1975, the Commission was chaired by two persons from the teacher category (one of these was actually a high school dean of boys) and five administrators. It should not be surprising that during this critical period, when the Commission was seeking and receiving legislative approval for its autonomous position, and when it was establishing itself as a force in Oregon education, that it should turn to principals and superintendents for leadership. They represented the powerful public school establishment which was making its influence felt in

the critical area of educational personnel development.

The last two chairmen of the Commission have both been teachers. One is an activist in the Oregon Federation of Teachers, and the current chairman is a strong spokesman for the Oregon Education Association. Many observers assume that this new pattern of leadership from teacher organizations will become a permanent feature of the Commission's existence.

VII

This study has briefly examined one hundred and twenty-eight years of certification and teacher education in Oregon, with particular attention to changing patterns of governance and control. A few generalizations may be hazarded on the basis of this research:

(1) As in all states, there has been a general trend toward centralization of these activities. Certification authority has moved from the county to the state level, and accreditation of teacher education programs has been a state function from its inception.

(2) Accompanying the process of centralization has been a bureaucratization of functions. Teacher examinations were originally rather informal and personal activities conducted at the local level by laymen. Certification evolved from this homey operation to one in which clerks in a Salem office made judgments on the basis of

transcripts and other documents.

(3) The "approved program approach" to certification was a partially successful effort to counter this trend toward bureaucratization. One assumption behind this change was that personnel in teacher education programs, who had personal knowledge of, and experience with candidates, could make sounder judgments about certification than could office personnel in Salem.

(4) The establishment of the Commission may also be seen as in part a counter-cyclical move in response to centralization and bureaucratization. Splitting off teacher education and certification activities from an already over-burdened State Board of Education represented a disperson of decision-making authority. And it is clear that educators see the Commission as less of an impersonal and unwieldy bureaucracy than the State Department of Education. Perhaps because the Commission was established in large part through the efforts of their professional organizations, teachers have more identity with it than they did with the Certification section of the State Department of Education.

(5) There has been a gradual movement from lay control to professional control of teacher preparation and licensing. The concept of lay <u>legal</u> control of these matters was

unchallenged during the first century of activity described above. But informal professional influence developed over the decades as state superintendents increasingly sought advice from professional educators. And since 1973, of course, educators have exercised full legal control as well.

(6) The above development may be interpreted as a move by educators to acquire democratic control over an important aspects of their professional lives. The laymen on the State Board no longer make decisions about the rules by which teachers shall be certificated or the programs in which they are prepared. Decision-making on such matters has been transferred to representatives of the groups affected. Protection for the public interest has been preserved in at least two ways: (1) the State Board appoints the members of the Commission, and (2) three public members participate fully and effectively in Commission decisions.

(7) While there has been a shift from lay to professional control of teacher preparation and licensing, there has also been a decided change in power relationships among educators. Within the Commission at least, influence has moved from higher education to administrators and now to teachers. And it appears that the pattern of dominance

by teachers and their professional organizations will remain for some time.

(8) The legal transfer of authority to the Commission has not made education into a profession as some have claimed. While Oregon educators now have the same <u>legal</u> authority over their occupation as do doctors and lawyers, they still lack some of the other essential characteristics of professions such as a body of research-based knowledge on which to base practice.(34)

Oregon educators are becoming increasingly aware of the significance of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. They are observing its activities with interest, with considerable hope, and with some apprehension. The next few decades will indicate whether recent efforts to decentralize, de-bureaucratize, democratize and professionalize teacher preparation and licensing prove successful. But successful or not, the pattern established in Oregon is becoming the model for professional governance in other states. Another of Oregon's experiments in government is well under way and is becoming the subject of continued observation and emulation.

Notes

1. Lawrence Cremin, The Wonderful World of Elwood Patterson Cubberley (New York, N.Y. 1965), p.48.
2. See for example, Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, edited by Jim Pearson and Edgar Fuller (Washington, D.C., 1969).
3. Lucien B. Kinney, Certification in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964); Willard Elsbree, The American Teacher (New York, 1939).
4. For evidence on this point in Oregon, see Robert Raymer, A History of the Superintendency of Public Instruction in the State of Oregon, 1849-1925 (Eugene, Oregon: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1926), preface.
5. Quoted in A History of the Certification of Teachers in Oregon, 1849-1932, by Harry V. Matthew (Eugene, Oregon: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1932), p. 9.
6. Matthew, p. 10.
7. Matthew, p. 8.
8. Raymer, pp, 15-16.
9. Quoted in Matthew, p. 18.
10. Matthew, p. 19.
11. Joy Hills Gubser, A Partial Analysis of Factors Involved in Requirement of a Five-Year Elementary Teacher Education Program in Oregon (Eugene, Oregon: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1963), p. 23. It should be noted

here that Dr. Gubser was not only a major chronicler and interpreter of these matters but was, during the 1950's and 1960's, also a leading participant in them. During much of this time she held various administrative positions in the State Department of Education, with primary responsibility for teacher education and certification. There is no reason to doubt the factual accuracy of her documentation, but one does find in her writings a consistent bias toward centralized administrative control through the State Department of Education.

12. Raymer, p. 36.
13. Matthew, p. 106; John C. Almack, "History of Oregon Normal Schools," Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society," XXI, June, 1920, p. 107-119.
14. Gubser, p. 25.
15. Matthew, p. 106.
16. Gubser, p. 25.
17. Bill A. Sampson, "A History of Secondary Teacher Training in Oregon," (Eugene, Oregon: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1950), p. 199.
18. Gubser, p. 26.
19. Gubser, pp. 27-8.
20. Gubser, p. 28.
21. Gubser, p. 33.
22. Gubser, p. 41. For further contemporary evidence of liberal arts dominance of teacher preparation, see Miles

Romney, "A Commentary on the Portland High School Curriculum Study," in Secondary Curriculum Reports, Oregon Association of Secondary School Principals - Commission on Curriculum Development, v. VII, #7, May, 1960, pp. 36-38.

23. Gubser, p. 44.

24. Quoted in Gubser, p. 51.

25. For a rather personal view of the development of NCTEPS, see Ralph W. McDonald, "The Professional Standards Movement in Teaching: Evolution of an Idea," in The Professional Standards Movement in Teaching: Progress and Projection, (Washington: National Education Association, 1956).

26. Margaret Lindsey, ed., New Horizons for the Teaching Profession, (Washington: National Education Association, 1961), p. 213.

27. This material, and that which follows, is summarized from A Comparative Analysis of States Having Three Forms of Teacher Education Governance, by Nancy Lusk Zimpher (Columbus: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1976), Chapter four.

28. This information and much of that below, is taken from minutes, publications, and annual reports of the Commission.

29. See the minutes of the Deans and Directors (now the

Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) for evidence on these developments.

30. Letter from Robert Gilberts, Dean of the College of Education, University of Oregon to Larry Perry, Chairman of the House Education Committee, March 13, 1973.

31. Zimpher, p. 102.

32. Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission - 1974 brochure (Salem, Oregon: 1974).

33. Minutes, Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, January 13, 1977.

34. For a detailed analysis of this point see: James M. Wallace, "The Making of A Profession: An Oregon Case Study," Phi Delta Kappan, 1977 (in press).